

**MINUTES**  
**BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY**  
**Monday, January 17, 2011**  
**City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604**  
**Green Bay, WI 54301**  
**3:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Michael Welch-Chair, Tom Diedrick, Rich Aicher.

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Paul Kendle, Darlene Hallet.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Nikki Aderholdt, Robyn Hallet, Matt Schampers, Rob Strong, Chip Law, Matt Roberts.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

1. Approval of the minutes from the December 20, 2010, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority.

R. Hallet indicated that a couple corrections were made to the minutes of the November 2010 meeting. Copies of the revised minutes were provided to the Commissioners.

A motion was made by T. Diedrick, seconded by R. Aicher, to approve the changes to the minutes of the November 15, 2010, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

2. Letter from U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development dated December 21, 2010, regarding approval of PHA Plan for 2011.

R. Hallet stated that this communication indicates that HUD has approved the BCHA's PHA Plan for 2011.

R. Aicher stated for clarification that the amendments made to the minutes were for the November 2010 meeting and the December 2010 minutes have not yet been approved.

R. Aicher and T. Diedrick indicated that they were not present for the December 2010 meeting. M. Welch inquired whether the Board should hold off on approving the December meeting minutes. R. Aicher indicated that he read the minutes and does not dispute any of the numbers provided, assuming they are accurate. R. Strong assured the Commissioners that the numbers reflected in the minutes are accurate.

A motion was made by M. Welch, seconded by R. Aicher, to approve the minutes from the December 20, 2010, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

**REPORTS:**

3. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program
  - A. Preliminary Applications

M. Roberts stated that there were 227 preliminary applications submitted for the month of December 2010, which is a slight increase from November's count of 185 applications.

B. Housing Assistance Payments

M. Roberts indicated that the HAP expenses ended at \$1,062,892 for the 2010 year.

C. Housing Assistance Unit Count

M. Roberts stated that the unit count for December 2010 was 2,835, which again is slightly higher than November's count of 2,824.

D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance

M. Roberts indicated that the initial pass percentage was 43.66; the re-evaluation pass percentage was 26.68; and the fail percentage was 29.76. These percentages are continuing to be fairly consistent from month to month.

E. Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Costs and HUD 52681B

C. Law stated that year-to-date, ICS is \$39,858.11 under budget. Technically, ICS received \$20,000 in December 2010 from HUD, which is believed to have been in error, and is included in the total \$39,858.11. C. Law stated that it is ICS's belief that they were not due those funds. Therefore, ICS is more accurately under budget about \$17,858.11.

C. Law indicated that ICS is just over 93 percent HAP utilization for the 2010 year, which puts the HCV Program at a standard performance rating instead of a high performer rating in SEMAP.

C. Law advised the Commissioners that ICS's Langan Investigations charges for the year were just under \$62,000 [\$61,956.34] for the year, and therefore ICS would not be seeking financial support from the BCHA. In 2009, the BCHA approved paying fees beyond ICS's \$72,000 contract with Langan Investigations.

R. Aicher questioned the five percent decrease in HAP utilization in the month of December compared to previous months. C. Law indicated that the HAP money received from HUD in December was \$82,000 more than they typically send ICS, so it significantly skewed the numbers. C. Law stated that this money was a proration backup, but should not affect the HCV SEMAP score.

F. Portability Activity

C. Law stated that the port-out dollars received in December were \$49,775.42, but the units are no longer provided on the recently revised 52681B. M. Schampers indicated that he would ensure that that information was incorporated back into the spreadsheet. C. Law stated that the port-in dollars received in December were \$3,374, and the unit count was 12.

G. SEMAP Monitoring Report

C. Law stated that all points would be received, except for the HAP utilization, which again will place the HCV program at a standard performer. This report will be submitted at the end of January.

H. Report of the Housing Choice Voucher Family Self-Sufficiency Program.

M. Roberts indicated that there was a nice jump in December 2010, resulting in 114 clients. There were 32 escrow accounts and no graduates from the FSS program in December.

I. Report on the Housing Choice Voucher Home Ownership Option.

M. Roberts stated that this count did not change from November, remaining at 93 clients.

M. Roberts indicated that there were 7 new contracts for the FSS program in December 2010.

J. VASH Reports

M. Roberts stated that the VASH clients remained at 11 from November to December. There were no new VASH clients and no cases are being managed.

K. Report on Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations

M. Roberts stated that for the month of December 2010, two new investigations were assigned; one investigation was closed; and three investigations are still active.

M. Roberts indicated that for the 169 new applications processed, three were additions to households, two were port-ins, and 16 were records checks.

L. Report on Leaving Homelessness Behind

C. Law provided a report on the Leaving Homelessness Behind project, which illustrates the number of adults and children that have been supported by the recent funding of \$20,000 from the BCHA. To date, this project has spent approximately \$4,300 on motel vouchers. This program, since the BCHA's donation, has received other grants and donations totaling an additional \$25,000.

C. Law stated that he will continue to provide a quarterly report on this project.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

4. Discussion and possible action on results of data collected from Housing Choice Voucher application residency surveys.

R. Hallet indicated that in November, BCHA staff presented the Commissioners with information collected from residency surveys distributed from August to October 2010. From that discussion, two questions arose: what was the preference distribution from the applicants, and how many applicants are approved and who actually gets on the waiting list.

R. Hallet stated that before answering those questions, a few disclaimers must be mentioned. First, the results compiled from the survey cannot be directly linked to the information compiled from the waiting list results because not all applicants completed the survey. Second, the surveys represent who has applied to the program, and that does not necessarily reflect who participates in the program. It was recently determined that only about 11 percent of those who apply actually receive a voucher. R. Hallet stated again, the applicants are not reflective of who participates in the HCV program.

R. Hallet explained that when the survey results were reported in November, BCHA staff unknowingly made a mistake reporting the total number of applicants from August through October; 492 applications were indicated and it should have been 713. The 492 reported was the number of complete applications received throughout that time period and does not reflect all applications, complete or otherwise. R. Hallet stated that out of the 713 total applications, 433 completed the survey, which is a 61 percent return rate. While initially this number seems low, there are other factors that could be affecting this rate. The biggest reason is because many service organizations throughout the community who provide applications on ICS's behalf may have older versions of the application packet. R. Hallet indicated that while these packets are still valid applications, they would not necessarily include new material, such as the survey. Another reason for the lower return rate could be simply that some applicants chose not to complete and return the survey.

R. Hallet indicated that BCHA staff was able to determine the preferences of applicants that applied from August through October 2010. Of the 713 applications, 42 selected a preference of displaced; 69 indicated the preference of elderly/disabled/veteran; 268 indicated they were a household with children; 93 indicated they were a household without children; 76 indicated that they were a non-preference applicant, meaning they are not Brown County residents; and 165 applicants' preferences were undetermined. R. Hallet stated we need to keep in mind that all of these numbers are based on what the applicant themselves denote on the application. The applicants must then follow up and provide proof for the preference they chose. While 42 indicated a preference of displaced, 27 neglected to return information to verify this preference and 8 were determined ineligible and removed from the waiting list. While 165 applicants' preferences were undetermined, 150 of those were undeterminable because they neglected to return the necessary information to determine a preference.

R. Hallet state that the numbers provided were a breakout of preferences for all of the applications received from August through October. The next set of numbers indicates the number of applicants who were transferred to occupancy, which means that an applicant has been invited for an interview at ICS. Of the 42 applicants indicating a displaced preference, four were transferred to occupancy. Of the 69 applicants claiming an elderly, disabled, or veteran's preference, 49 were transferred to occupancy. Of the 268 claiming a household with children preference, 210 were transferred to occupancy. Of the 93 claiming a household without children preference, 72 were transferred to occupancy. Of the 76

claiming a non-preference, zero applicants were transferred to occupancy, which is logical as ICS is not pulling from the non-preference waiting list at this time. And of the 165 undetermined applications, 10 were transferred to occupancy. The reason 10 applicants that have an undetermined status were transferred to occupancy is because applicants for the Mod 8 program, port-ins, and project-based vouchers do not filter through the standard waiting list. These individuals are only on the waiting list module of the software to allow them to be transferred over into another program.

R. Hallet continued, stating that 340 applicants were successfully transferred to the waiting list, which represents 48 percent of all applicants. Of those 340 applicants, 212 of them received a voucher (30 percent of all applicants), while 128 do not have a voucher issuance date. Not having a voucher issuance date means either the applicant has not had their appointment yet; had their appointment, missed it and had to reschedule; or they've missed more than two appointments and their application has thus been closed.

R. Aicher clarified the results under the displaced preference, stating that of the 42 applicants, 35 did not qualify. This resulted in a remaining 7 applicants, only four of which were transferred to occupancy. R. Hallet concurred. M. Welch questioned if this same math was applicable to the undetermined category. N. Aderholdt clarified that while BCHA staff only indicated the reasons for 35 of the 42 applicants claiming a displaced preference not being transferred to occupancy, there were three of the 7 remaining that were not eligible for one reason or another as well. The staff did not list those other reasons because it was an insignificant number. N. Aderholdt continued stating that of the 165 undetermined applicants, 150 neglected to return necessary information and 5 other applicants failed to prove eligibility, resulting in 10 being transferred to occupancy.

R. Strong stated that what BCHA staff is trying to show is that of the people that apply for the program, those that are non-preference are not getting on the program. The results also show that while a large percentage of HCV participants are elderly and disabled, the applicants' demographics are shifting to families.

R. Aicher questioned why only four of the seven displaced applicants were transferred to occupancy. R. Hallet replied that as N. Aderholdt explained, the remaining three of the displaced applicants not transferred to occupancy were ineligible for a reason other than those listed. R. Aicher confirmed that if the applicant would have provided ICS with the necessary information and everything was verified, they would have been transferred as well. R. Aicher questioned whether the applicant's failure to be transferred to occupancy was due to their failure to provide the necessary information. R. Hallet confirmed. R. Strong indicated that this logic is applicable to all of the preference categories.

R. Strong inquired whether these results were tied to the survey. R. Hallet indicated that while the results were pulled from the same time period, they cannot be tied to the survey results. T. Diedrick recommended alterations to the format of the application results to greater ensure understanding and misinterpretation. R. Strong stated that while there is interest about the program from outside Brown County that does not mean they are getting on the program; those applying for the program are not necessarily those participating in the program.

N. Aderholdt indicated that the reason for bringing this information forward to the Commissioners was to seek guidance on what information to present and how to present it to the County Board of Supervisors. R. Hallet indicated that the County Board did request that BCHA staff provide them the results from the survey, but we would like that information or directive on what to provide and how to provide it to come from the BCHA Board rather than the staff.

R. Strong indicated that the County Board has a right to see all the information that the BCHA staff has, but we should try and package it in a way that answers their questions sufficiently.

R. Strong questioned if the Commissioners had any questions or comments on the survey results that were previously presented. N. Aderholdt indicated that when the results were compiled, staff attempted to remain as neutral as possible in presenting it so as to not appear skewed.

R. Hallet indicated that there were a few points in the data previously presented that needed further clarification. There were two questions on the survey itself that asked about the reasons for living in Brown County. The first time, it asked "why did you leave Brown County?" which was intended for applicants who left the County and have returned. When the data was compiled it was misrepresented to mean "why are you moving back into the County?" This correction has been made to the survey results. R. Hallet stated that coincidentally, the top two reasons applicants indicated for moving out of the County [family and friends, and employment opportunities] are the same reasons why many applicants indicated they are living or remaining in Brown County, which was the second variation of this question on the survey.

R. Aicher clarified that the friends and family in the area means the area they are moving to, not Brown County. R. Hallet indicated that this is what the survey intended to portray, but applicants may interpret it differently. R. Strong recommended removing this question from the survey results and not regard it as reliable information. R. Aicher agreed.

R. Hallet stated that BCHA staff will likely use the information on the handout as a baseline for the information they will present to the County Board. R. Hallet indicated that if the Commissioners had any comments or suggestions on the presentation of this material, to let the BCHA staff know. N. Aderholdt stated that all comments or suggestions are appreciated.

C. Law stated that the biggest disclaimer, which R. Hallet does a good job of explaining, is that the survey results portray applicants, not participants. C. Law indicated that if one thing were to be emphasized it would be that applicants do not accurately reflect participants. N. Aderholdt reiterated that you cannot tie the survey to the participants of the HCV program; they were separated initially and cannot be reunited at this point. R. Aicher clarified that who wants to get on the program and who gets on the program are two completely different groups of people. M. Welch stated that that is really critical to portray when presenting this information.

R. Hallet questioned if staff should present both sets of data or just the survey results to the County Board. R. Strong indicated that the fact that the BCHA Board asked particular questions in regards to preferences should be indicated in the report presented to the County Board. R. Aicher stated that in some way,

BCHA staff has to come forth with the data because if the Commissioners found it significant, the County Board likely will too. N. Aderholdt stated that it is important that both sets of information are presented because even though we will state repeatedly that the survey results do not reflect participants of the program, some will assume that it does.

N. Aderholdt requested that all comments and suggestions be provided prior to the next BCHA meeting, as that will be when BCHA staff presents the revised reports to the Commissioners. R. Strong indicated that the Commissioners should receive a final copy of the reports. N. Aderholdt indicated that again, the BCHA staff would like the reports to come directly from the guidance of the BCHA Board. R. Aicher stated that these reports should be wrapped up after the next meeting to ensure that the data is as new and accurate as possible.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

5. Review and approval of the BCHA budget for the 2011 calendar year, including review of investments.

M. Schampers indicated that there is not a review of the BCHA investments provided as BCHA staff is currently working on completing the close out for the accounts. Primarily, the investments consist of repurchase agreements.

The first page is regarding the Housing Choice Voucher program, which is the majority of the budget. The remaining pages are the other BCHA programs, but are non-HCV. M. Schampers stated that there is a combined page for all of the programs, but there is some work remaining to be done on that report so it was not provided. However, when reviewing the reports, it will be clear that over 99 percent of the budget is in reference to the Housing Choice Voucher program.

M. Welch questioned if the first report is year to date, effective October 26, 2010. M. Schampers indicated that that is correct and that date is when that portion of the budget was initiated; only this past week were those numbers finalized.

M. Schampers explained the numbers, starting with revenue. He indicated that interest for the 2011 budget [\$2,668] was determined by taking the past three months of interest and annualized it for the year. HAP income [\$12,239,670] was determined by referring to the calendar year in VMS, which provides average income, and annualized that number. Administrative fee income [\$1,349,814] was determined by using the last six-month average because that is dependent on the usage each month. The FSS Home Coordinator income [\$90,308] must be applied for, and the number provided based on the assumption that ICS would only be funded for two positions again. The Homeownership grant funding wasn't budgeted for because there is not an effective way to determine how many new homeowners the BCHA will have, and it is an insignificant amount compared to the rest of the budget. Fraud recovery [\$105,000] was determined by annualizing the previous year; the majority of this funding comes within the first few months of the year.

M. Schampers moved on to expenses. Salaries and wages [\$46,367] were determined by taking the 2011 wages and fringes and applying the time card percentages indicated by staff as being spent on BCHA-related work. Legal fees [\$5,302] were averaged and annualized to determine a 2011 amount. Staff training [\$790] refers to a training session that was budgeted and approved for 2010, but M. Schampers was unable to attend and must go to this year. This

expense is shared with the Green Bay Housing Authority as the training refers to programs provided by both housing authorities. The audit expenses [\$2,938] are based on the audit bids that were previously approved. The audit is billed out to each of the programs based on the amount of funds invested in each. Printing [\$796], postage [\$331], and office supplies [\$357] expenses are annualized. Membership expenses are usually the same [\$50], but the BCHA staff has become a member of another association resulting in the increase [\$75]. Publications/notices [\$74] and telephone [\$18] expenses are annualized. The miscellaneous category shows varying amounts over the year which is due to fraud recoveries. Recently, the BCHA had to reimburse the Clerk of Courts for fees that were thought to be exempt so the BCHA had to go back to 2007 and repay all court fees through the current date. The 2011 budgeted expense was estimated to be about \$6,400.

M. Schampers stated that contract costs for administration [\$1,301,221] were determined by a formula, which is paid to ICS. Contract costs for FSS/Homeownership Coordinator [\$112,885] were determined again through collaboration with ICS staff and R. Hallet. Contract costs for IT [\$3,159] were annualized based on what the City of Green Bay IT Department charges. Employee benefits [\$20,691] are tied in with salaries and wages, which are a percentage of our total benefits based on the amount of time staff spends on BCHA-related projects. Insurance [\$5,095] was annualized, and is billed to the Authority each month. The insurance premiums stay consistent each month, with a slight fluctuation during the renewal month. HAP payments [\$12,133,693] are annualized and again these are based on the previous six-month period. Homeownership counseling [\$2,500] expenses were an estimate provided by R. Hallet based on previous years. Depreciation expense [\$55] is a function of the BCHA's fixed assets, which have not fluctuated since M. Schampers began employment.

R. Aicher questioned why the interest revenue projected is smaller than 2010. M. Schampers indicated that he did not know for certain off hand, and would provide a better answer at a later time, but the percentage the BCHA receive for the previous three months was utilized and then multiplied it by the account earning interest. M. Schampers indicated that he will look into this further and provide clearer clarification.

The Commissioners indicated a few grammatical errors that should be corrected. M. Welch suggested having a column of projected excess shortfall for all previous years listed. M. Schampers indicated that he will make this a uniform row to incorporate on all pages.

M. Welch indicated that looking at Account 53 of the budget, the biggest expense was homeowner assistance, which was \$30,000. R. Aicher stated that the one item that jumps around a little is the depreciation expense; under Account 57, the expense ranges from \$3,000 to \$4,300; some accounts have no depreciation expense; Account 53 has roughly \$1,500 indicated. M. Schampers stated that the reason for that is because depreciation gets charged back to the program that purchased the fixed asset. All items that were purchased in the programs listed were done so prior to M. Schamper's employment, so he is unable to indicate what those fixed assets are off-hand. Under Account 57, in 2009 the number is different due to the purchase of the Impala. When the previous senior accountant set up the Impala account, it was set up as a 10-year asset, but cars



are a 5-year asset. Most of the things listed on the accounts have been capitalized and probably shouldn't have been.

R. Aicher questioned what the present use of the Impala is. M. Schampers indicated that the main use is by BCHA and GBHA staff, but it does get used by other staff from other departments in the office. When that happens, the Authority bills that department for its mileage and fuel. R. Aicher questioned where the car is parked. R. Strong ensured that the vehicle is parked in the City Hall parking lot.

R. Aicher indicated that he was just curious about its use because if it gets to the point where the Impala's use is only for BCHA activities 20 or 30 percent of the time, perhaps the Authority should look at selling it to the department that utilizes it the most. R. Strong indicated that BCHA staff can look into this.

A motion was made by T. Diedrick, seconded by R. Aicher, to approve the BCHA budget for the 2011 Fiscal/Calendar Year. Motion carried.

R. Aicher stated that the issue with the interest rates should be researched further because they shouldn't be a guess. Now is a good time to review the investments.

**INFORMATIONAL:**

None

**BILLS:**

A motion was made by T. Diedrick, seconded by R. Aicher, to approve the bills. Motion carried.

**STAFF REPORT:**

6. Brown County Housing Authority 2010 Activities Summary

R. Hallet stated that because BCHA staff had some last minute items to add to the summary, it will not be available until the next meeting.

R. Strong stated that there are a few members of the Authority that are up for reappointment. There were two of the reappointments that were brought forward to the County Executive, who would like to take another look at those positions. R. Strong indicated that Tom Hinz, the County Executive, feels obligated to replace one of the current BCHA Commissioners with someone from a Section 8-concentrated neighborhood. He is unsure how this will unfold, but there more than likely will be a change that will occur for the BCHA Board. R. Strong stated that he did request that Tom Hinz let him know prior to moving forward to the County Board with his recommendation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

naa: rah

**Brown County Housing Authority  
List of Bills  
January 17, 2011**

<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Conversion Program	
Section 8 Program:	
Green Bay City Treasurer (Nov 10, Printing & Postage)	48.30
Green Bay City Treasurer (Nov 10, IP Phone Allocation)	15.00
Green Bay City Treasurer (Dec 10, IP Phone Allocation)	15.00
Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition	25.00
80-81 CDBG Program:	
84 CDBG Program:	
WHNCP Program:	
B.C. Rental Rehab Loans:	
Revenue Bond Program:	
WHEDA Program:	
HCRI Program:	
HOME Program:	
HOME Program-Rpd CHDO Qualify:	
Total Bills	<u>\$ 103.30</u>